

Windham Regional Commission,

I wanted to let you know that I am a business owner in downtown Brattleboro, and I feel strongly that Entergy's license should not be extended. I am not worried about how the closure of the plant will affect our community as I am convinced that jobs in alternative green energy sources will be created.

Alice Laughlin  
Dragonfly Dry Goods  
136 Main Street  
Brattleboro, Vermont

---

Dear WRC,

I am writing this email simply to make my voice known in the discussion regarding the relicensing of Vermont Yankee.

It has been stated in the Reformer that business owners in the region are in favor of the continued operation of VY beyond the 2012 date for decommissioning currently in place. Whereas this is no doubt true for some business owners, I am not among them.

I have actually worked at Vermont Yankee during the 1992 maintenance shutdown. From the inside perspective I am familiar with many aspects of the operations and personnel who work there. I am not a flaming anti-nuke person. Yet I am also keenly aware that the 2012 date for decommissioning was put in place for very sound engineering reasons that Entergy is attempting to bypass and modify for the purpose of maintaining a healthy profit for shareholders.

Profit is certainly a valid motivation for many activities in our society. As a business person, I truly understand this. But I am of the opinion that the profit motive for relicensing VY is placing the welfare of our community at unacceptable risk. Structural wear and fatigue are profound elements that build on the ever-present inevitability of human error. The catastrophic results of a nuclear/radiation accident at VY to our very lives are not worth the benefits of Entergy's continued financial prosperity.

We, as a society, possess the ability to compensate for the shutdown of VY if we are willing and sufficiently motivated. Accepting the current licensing limits is, in my opinion, wise in the eyes of those who originally designed and planned for the plant's safe operation. Extension of the VY operations to 2032 is an action that will greatly increase the risk of an event that will change the lives of everyone who lives and works here with no return or repair possible following radiation

contamination.

The very thought of destroying this area with such an accidental event is almost more than I can bring myself to envision. Are we, are you, willing to look back and say that we should not have extended the license of Vermont Yankee when we have a clear opportunity, at this moment, to exercise the wisdom of care and foresight for ourselves and our community?

Please work for our safety and our community. Do not put the financial motivations of a distant corporation above the lives and health of our people.

Yours,

William Hays  
103 Main Street  
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301  
802-257-5181

---

To Whom it may concern;

As a business owner in downtown Brattleboro, I must sincerely voice my opposition to the planned relicensing of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant beyond year 2012. My opposition is based on the obvious. Age of the plant; nuclear waste storage; extraction of plutonium from the earth; transport of highly toxic material; all lethal to life on planet Earth should anything, small or great, go wrong. Evacuation plans are far less than adequate should any disaster occur. Please consider these concerns when voicing an opinion on the continued operation of Vermont Yankee beyond 2012. Thank you.!

Peace to you,

Byron F Greatorex  
co-owner  
In The Moment Music and Gifts  
143 Main Street  
Brattleboro, VT 05301  
802-257-8171

---

Alison Macrae  
Verde for Garden and Home  
133 Main Street  
Brattleboro, VT 05301  
802-258-3908  
verde@sover.net

April 2, 2008

Dear Windham Regional Commission,

I am writing to you as I know you are currently collecting comments from the public regarding extension of Entergy's license to operate Vermont Yankee for another twenty years, which you are going to be handing on to the Public Service Board.

I am owner of a business in downtown Brattleboro, currently struggling in today's economy, who is opposed to extension of Entergy's license at Vermont Yankee. I have been in business for seven years, employing three to six people, depending on the shop's seasonal needs. I have lived in the area since 1977 and in Guilford, just a few miles from the nuclear power plant, for the last eleven years.

Since Entergy bought Vermont Yankee, I have become increasingly alarmed about how vulnerable a position I am in, given that I am unable to procure insurance for my home or business in the event of an accident at the plant. This amazing fact never seems to get seriously considered or addressed and is a huge source of stress for me. My husband and I have worked hard all our lives and are nearing retirement. We are heavily invested in our lives here, financially and emotionally. We could lose everything we have worked so hard to build. I am aware of the Price Anderson Act which is supposed to deal with this issue, but the reality is that people like us will never receive compensation even close to our investment. One only has to look at how our Federal Government took care of the victims of Katrina to see how people really get treated and how much money is made available to them.

I'm afraid the Public Service Board may have the impression that the Brattleboro business community is behind the relicensing of Vermont Yankee, just as they may think that the vast majority of residents of this area are also in favor of it. I would like to suggest that this is very far from the truth. Many people who oppose it are well informed on the issues, have attended, as have I, endless public meetings over so many years, with so few results to allay our fears, that they have given up. Many other people for the most part choose to not get involved because having a nuclear power plant in their backyard is a scary thing to ponder and they would rather not think about it. I know, for instance, that all the people who work for me at Verde are opposed to the relicensing, but none of them have ever been to any of the meetings, so their voices have not been heard.

On the other hand, Entergy has done a media public relations blitz and it has been extremely effective. Many people in Brattleboro are aware of the

"sponsorships" of events and "donations" to many of our non-profit organisations that Entergy funds. What they don't see is that this is just the "cost of doing business" for Entergy, ultimately paid for by the rate payers.

Mostly I am concerned that by granting an extension of the license to Entergy, Vermont will be going down a road that will be deeply regretted in the long-term. If our future energy needs for the next twenty years are tied in with Vermont Yankee, there will not be the market nor the incentive for other technologies (many of which could be Vermont-based and provide many jobs) to step forward and take Vermont into truly green and sustainable options.

Another twenty years of operation at VY will also increase drastically the unspeakably dangerous situation we have in our backyard of nuclear waste from spent fuel at the plant. The serious safety implications are only one aspect of the nuclear waste problem. The most troubling part is the "true cost" financially to Vermont. While Entergy's public relations juggernaut is rolling relentlessly on in order to procure the license extension, with warnings of higher electricity costs to Vermonters if it doesn't get relicensed, it is also trying to sell off its nuclear plants to a newly formed "limited liability corporation". What does that mean for Vermont? The likelihood that Entergy could walk away without fulfilling its obligations to deal with the nuclear waste it is producing, is not so far fetched. The fact that there is not enough money in the de-commissioning fund at this time shows where their priorities lie. Entergy is a corporation out to make money for its investors. If we are not careful Vermont is going to be left with the bill for cleaning up the mess they leave behind when they finally leave, whether from a shut-down in 2012 or 2032. How can it be determined what the cost of de-commissioning is anyway and what about the cost for the state decades after shutdown, when the dry cask storage is deteriorating, which it surely will over time. This is a concern right now with the amount of fuel already in storage, not to mention what is still in the pool. Another twenty years with the uprate and we have an untenable situation on our hands. I imagine that the State of Vermont will have to carry that burden forever and I can't begin to imagine the cost and how future generations will pay for it.

Lastly, if it is inevitable that Entergy gets its license extension, we in this area especially, but the whole of Vermont as well, need to know that our investment in choosing VY over other energy sources is going to be a sound one. It has to be able to operate efficiently and safely and a truly independent assessment has to be done prior to granting the license extension. Entergy has been able to get away with giving us less than a state-of-the-art option for storage of the nuclear waste. Are we going to let them also get away with a less than thorough inspection as well? We

need one that is truly independent. And why is a license for twenty years being considered with such an old plant? Why not five years?

Thank you for your work on behalf of the citizens of Windham County.

Yours sincerely,

Alison Macrae

---

Dear Friends, As a Brattleboro business owner (Amy's Bakery Arts Cafe, 113 Main St.), I would like to state my opposition to the extension of Entergy's license to operate Vermont Yankee. Please "cast my vote" as such and I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Amy Comerchero

---

To: Windham Regional Commission

As a business person, I believe that extending the life of Vermont Yankee is a waste of money.

There are certainly more efficient ways of producing energy and many of them are more eco-friendly. VY will eventually have to shut down and then new ways of energy production will be entertained. Why wait?

Just because we made a bad decision a couple of decades ago and gave the okay to build the thing doesn't mean we can't look at that decision and recognize that it makes little sense today.

I am opposed to VY's continuation through 2032. It should be decommissioned.

We simply must find a more responsible way to meet our energy needs.

David Lampe-Wilson  
Mystery on Main Street  
119 Main St.  
Brattleboro VT 05301

---

To Windham Regional Commission

I would like to let you know that since the inception of the Latchis Project, Vermont Yankee, now Entergy Vermont Yankee LLC, has given valuable support to Brattleboro Arts Initiative.

Brattleboro Arts Initiative is very appreciative that Entergy Vermont Yankee LLC chooses to support the arts in our community.

Thank you.  
Gail Nunziata

Gail Nunziata, Managing Director  
Brattleboro Arts Initiative &  
Latchis Corporation

## Windham Regional Commission Comments from Hattie Nestel 3/26/08

### Areas of concern regarding continued operation of Vermont Yankee

1. The cooling towers were last inspected in May during a refueling outage,(Brattleboro Reformer 10/4/07), yet failed to find the problem that caused the collapse. This was three months before the collapse. Workers had been on the roof shortly before the collapse. They could have been killed if they had been on the roof when the tower collapsed.
2. Arnie Gundersen gave testimony to the PSB on October 3, 2003, regarding potential impact of a 20% uprate on the cooling towers. Mr. Gundersen's conclusions, page 8, state, "First, ENVY has stated that the fans will operate considerably longer. This will increase the dynamic and torsional loads on the structures. Second the towers will be hotter, which will add additional structural stress to the wood as well as increase the rate at which the wood disintegrates." His testimony should have been enough to prevent granting a 20% uprate to VY. However, the 20% uprate was granted and resulting inspections of the cooling towers failed to find problems that Mr. Gundersen predicted. Vermont Yankee admitted its inspections of the cooling towers left something to be desired. Uldus Vanags, Vermont state nuclear engineer, stated, "They realized that the inspection procedures they were following before, the vendors's procedures, were inadequate". (BR 9/21/07)

With sufficient Vermont Public Safety Board oversight and by not granting permission for the uprate, problems leading to unsafe conditions at VY might have been avoided.

3. The NRC has often been guilty of inadequate oversight or failure to report problems to Congress. For example, thirty-five liters of highly enriched uranium solution leaked onto the floor of the Nuclear Fuel Services plant in Erwin, Tennessee, in March 2006. The NRC didn't tell congress about the leak for 14 months. In 2002, workers at the Davis-Besse plant in Ohio discovered a football-size hole in a reactor head. The hole threatened to create a radioactive disaster was overlooked during safety inspections by the NRC for over a period of six years. David Lochbaum of the Union of Concerned Scientists has stated, "The NRC is not an aggressive enforcer of regulations; it is an enabler of non-conforming behavior." Glaring examples of lack of NRC oversight should be discomfoting to anyone who is in a role of guaranteeing public safety.

4. a. What weight should the board give to the Office of the Inspector General report on Nuclear Regulatory Commission inspections?  
Why should the public have confidence in the NRC?
- b. The Public Service Board never released the OIG report to VSNAP or the public. Although the OIG audit had been released by the NRC September 9th, it was not discovered until mid-November by the New England Coalition who released it to the Brattleboro Reformer when it was published on November 21, 2007. Should the public trust the PSB?
5. Entergy stated a radioactive shipment leaving VY August 31, 2006, to be 60 millirems per hour, but when it reached it's destination in Pennsylvania it registered 820 millirems per hour. Has Vermont taken any responsibility for oversight of these radioactive shipments?
6. Decommissioning funds-What responsibility should be required of Entergy to cover costs of total decommissioning? How has Vermont shown responsibility to the public to make sure that Entergy, will be able to immediately decommission Vermont Yankee in 2012 when its license expires as was done in Maine?
7. Although the federal Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 guaranteed that all radioactive high level waste would be removed by the federal government to a national repository by 1998, that has not happened. It is generally acknowledged that the Yucca Mountain repository, after twenty years of digging at the expense of \$11 billion, is never going to be able to safely store high level waste. Is Vermont ready to create a high level waste dump in-state to make up for what the federal government has failed to provide?
8. The Union of Concerned Scientists has supported federal legislation offered by Vermont's United States Senator Bernie Sanders for an in-depth, thoroughly independent inspection of Vermont Yankee. Should Vermonters settle for anything less?
9. Vermont Yankee is located on a 100 year flood plain. The intended dry cask storage canisters have vent holes at top and bottom so that cold air can circulate and keep the high level spent fuel rods from a chain reaction and meltdown. These casks are projected to be on a concrete slab 254.0 feet above the river. John Hoffman, in testimony to the PSB in 2005 reports the probable maximum flood could reach a stage elevation of 252.5 feet. When asked at the VSNAP hearing what would happen if the muddy flood waters exceeded that, Entergy Representative Dave McElwee replied that they would use sandbags. Is this a safe, reliable plan for unknown years that these casks might have to be there?
-